



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,905	08/06/2003	Weiniu Gan	CL001147DIV	8380
25748	7590	02/28/2006	EXAMINER	
CELERA GENOMICS ATTN: WAYNE MONTGOMERY, VICE PRES, INTEL PROPERTY 45 WEST GUDE DRIVE C2-4#20 ROCKVILLE, MD 20850			ROBINSON, HOPE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1656	
DATE MAILED: 02/28/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/634,905

Applicant(s)

GAN ET AL.

Examiner

Hope A. Robinson

Art Unit

1656

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Restriction/Election

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-2 and 13-14, drawn to an isolated peptide, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
 - II. Claim 3, drawn to an antibody, classified in class 530, subclass 387.1.
 - III. Claims 4-5, drawn to a method of producing the peptide, classified in class 435, subclass 69.1.
 - IV. Claim 6, drawn to a method of detecting the presence of the peptide, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
 - V. Claims 7-9 and 12, drawn to a method of identifying a modulator/agent that binds the peptide, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.
 - VI. Claim 10, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition, classified in class 530, subclass 300.
 - VII. Claim 11, drawn to a method of treating a disease or condition mediated by the peptide, classified in class 514, subclass 2.

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

The proteins of Invention I are related to the antibodies of Invention II by virtue of being the cognate antigen, necessary for the production of antibodies. Although the

Art Unit: 1656

protein and antibody are related due to the necessary steric complementarity of the two, they are distinct Inventions because the protein can be used in another and materially different process from the use for the production of the antibody, such as in a pharmaceutical composition in its own right, or to assay or purify the natural ligand of the protein (if the protein is itself a receptor), or in assays for the identification of agonists or antagonists of the receptor protein.

Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product can be used in a materially different process of using that product for example the protein can be used to make antibodies.

Inventions I and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product can be used in a materially different process of using that product for example the protein can be used in a bioassay.

Inventions I and V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process

Art Unit: 1656

for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product can be used in a materially different process of using that product for example the protein can be used to make antibodies.

Inventions I and VII are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product can be used in a materially different process of using that product for example the protein can be used an assay.

Invention II is unrelated to Invention III. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product (antibody) can be used in materially different process and is not used in the method of Invention III, for example, the antibody can be used in a vaccine.

Invention II is unrelated to Invention IV. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the

Art Unit: 1656

product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product (antibody) can be used in materially different process and is not used in the method of Invention III, for example, the antibody can be used in a vaccine.

Invention II is unrelated to Invention V. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product (antibody) can be used in materially different process and is not used in the method of Invention III, for example, the antibody can be used in a vaccine.

Invention II is unrelated to Invention VII. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product (antibody) can be used in materially different process and is not used in the method of Invention III, for example, the antibody can be used in a vaccine.

The products of Inventions I-II and VI are patentably distinct. The products of Inventions I and II differ structurally and have different modes of operation. Although the product of Invention VI can contain the products of Inventions I and II, the composition can also have other components or ingredients, which could outweigh the activity of the

Art Unit: 1656

antibody or protein. Further, the compositions have a different mode of operation than a antibody or protein administered directly.

The methods of Inventions III-V and VII are patentably distinct, having different end points and method steps.

3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Furthermore, the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art as a separate subject for inventive effect and require independent searches. The search for each of the above inventions is not co-extensive particularly with regard to the literature search. A reference, which would anticipate the invention of one group, would not necessarily anticipate or make obvious the other group. Moreover, as to the question of burden of search, classification of subject matter is merely one indication of the burdensome nature of the search involved. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and because of their recognized divergent subject matter, election of a single group for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP §

Art Unit: 1656

821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(l).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hope A. Robinson whose telephone number is 571-272-0957. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathleen Kerr, can be reached at (571) 272-0931. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/634,905
Art Unit: 1656

Page 9

Hope Robinson, MS *HR*
Patent Examiner *2/21/06*

HOPE ROBINSON
PATENT EXAMINER